

Report of the Revisit Team to California State University, Monterey Bay

June 2015

Overview of this Report

This item is the accreditation team report for the May 4-5, 2015 revisit to California State University, Monterey Bay. This item provides the report of the revisit team as well as the revisit team recommendations regarding the stipulations and the accreditation status.

Recommendations

Background

On the basis of the accreditation team report to in April 2014 https://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmi/xsl/cnt/11-CSU%20Monterey%20Bay%20Report%20FINAL.pdf?db=PSD_Program_Sponsors_DB&-lay=php_Accreditation_Reports_list&-recid=20&-field=COA_Report_Site_Visit) the team made the following accreditation decision for CSU Monterey Bay and all its credential programs: **Accreditation with Major Stipulations.**

The stipulations in 2014 read as follows:

- 1) The institution must provide a clear description and supporting documentation to address all Program Standards for the Education Specialist and Added Authorization in Special Education credential program found to be not met. For each standard this information must include:
 - a. A succinct description of how candidates demonstrate competency in standard requirements.
 - b. The scoring rubric(s) and/or other measures used to determine candidate competency as well as evidence showing how the indicators directly relate to each of the required candidate competencies.
- 2) No new programs will be approved by the Committee on Accreditation until the stipulation above is fully addressed.
- 3) Within one year, the institution will undergo an accreditation revisit.

2014 Stipulation	2015 Revisit Team Recommendation
<p>1) The institution must provide a clear description and supporting documentation to address all Program Standards for the Education Specialist and Added Authorization in Special Education credential program found to be not met. For each standard this information must include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A succinct description of how candidates demonstrate competency in standard requirements. b. The scoring rubric(s) and/or other measures used to determine candidate competency as well as evidence showing how the indicators directly relate to each of the required candidate competencies. 	Removal of Stipulation
<p>2) No new programs will be approved by the Committee on Accreditation until the stipulation above is fully addressed</p>	Removal of Stipulation
<p>3) Within one year, the institution will undergo an accreditation revisit.</p>	Removal of Stipulation

**California Commission on Teacher Credentialing
Committee on Accreditation
Revisit Team Report**

Institution: California State University, Monterey Bay

Date of Revisit: April 4-5, 2015

Accreditation Team Recommendation: Accreditation

Rationale: Based on the evidence presented at the revisit the team concludes that all Common and Program Standards are now met. Therefore, the team recommends removal of all stipulations and the accreditation status of **Accreditation**.

2015 Revisit Team Standard Findings

NCATE/Common Standards	2014 Team Findings	2015 Revisit Findings
1) Candidate Knowledge, Skills and Professional Dispositions	Not Met (C.S. 9)	Met
6) Unit Governance and Resources	Met with Concerns (C.S. 3)	Met
CTC Common Standard 6: Advice and Assistance	Met with Concerns	Met
Program Standards	2014 Team Findings	2015 Revisit Findings
Multiple Subjects		
Program Standard 2	Met with Concerns	Met
Program Standard 14	Met with Concerns	Met
Program Standard 15	Met with Concerns	Met
Single Subject		
Program Standard 1	Met with Concerns	Met
Program Standard 8	Met with Concerns	Met
Program Standard 12	Met with Concerns	Met
Program Standard 15	Met with Concerns	Met

Program Standards	2014 Team Findings	2015 Revisit Findings
Education Specialist		
Program Standard 3	Not Met	Met
Program Standard 4	Not Met	Met
Program Standard 5	Not Met	Met
Program Standard 8	Not Met	Met
Program Standard 10	Not Met	Met
Program Standard 14	Not Met	Met
Program Standard 7	Met with Concerns	Met
Program Standard 9	Met with Concerns	Met
Program Standard 13	Met with Concerns	Met
Mild Moderate		
Program Standard 2	Not Met	Met
Program Standard 6	Not Met	Met
Program Standard 3	Met with Concerns	Met
Moderate Severe		
Program Standard 5	Not Met	Met
Autism Spectrum Disorders AA		
Program Standard 1	Not Met	Met

On the basis of the findings, the team recommends the removal of all stipulations

Further, staff recommends that:

- CSU Monterey Bay be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation
- That CSU Monterey Bay continue in its assigned cohort on the schedule of accreditation activities, subject to the continuance of the accreditation activities by the Commission on Teacher Credentialing.
-

On the basis of this recommendation, CSU Monterey Bay is authorized to recommend candidates for the following credential:

Initial Credentials

Multiple Subject
Multiple Subject Intern (Inactive)
Single Subject
Single Subject, Intern
Education Specialist Mild Moderate
Education Specialist Moderate Severe
Education Specialist, Intern

Advanced Credentials

Education Specialist Level II (*no longer able to admit due to transition to new standards*)
Reading Certificate (*inactive*)

Accreditation Revisit Team

Chair: **Mark Cary**
Davis Joint Unified School District, retired

Member: **Bob Loux**
Stanislaus County Office of Education

Member **Nanette Fritchmann**
National University
(Assisted up until the site visit)

Staff to the Accreditation Team: **Cheryl Hickey**

Interviews Conducted	
Institutional Administration	3
Faculty	20
Candidates	26
Graduates	0
Cooperating Teachers	17
University Supervisors	15
Institutional Leaders	2
Program Coordinators	3
Total	86

Note: In some cases, individuals were interviewed by more than one team member (especially faculty) because of the multiple roles the individual has at the institution.

Background

California State University, Monterey Bay hosted a visit on March 9-11, 2014. This was CSU Monterey Bay's regularly scheduled site visit and continuing NCATE visit. The report from the March 2014 accreditation site visit is available on the Commission's Accreditation Reports webpage at:

https://info.ctc.ca.gov/fmi/xsl/cnt/11-CSU%20Monterey%20Bay%20Report%20FINAL.pdf?-db=PSD_Program_Sponsors_DB&-lay=php_Accreditation_Reports_list&-recid=20&-field=COA_Report_Site_Visit.

In April 2014, the Committee on Accreditation placed four stipulations on CSUMB and determined that the accreditation decision was **Accreditation with Major Stipulations**. A revisit was required within one year of the action of the COA.

Soon after the visit, CSUMB underwent significant restructuring (see Common Standards). The consultant and the team lead worked throughout the year following the visit with the newly hired dean and newly appointed faculty chair to discuss the steps that were being taken by the institution to address the stipulations and what evidence the revisit team would need to see in order to recommend removal of the stipulations. Because one of the stipulations was to complete the program assessment process, additional evidence was provided and reviewed by reviewers prior to the revisit.

The team lead assisted the institution in better understanding the specific part of each standard that was yet to be sufficiently addressed and suggested the types of evidence that would allow the revisit team to determine that the standard was met.

Typically in an accreditation revisit, the institution is required to address the stipulations and not necessarily each standard less than fully met. In the case of CSUMB, the dean requested that the revisit team also review the changes the institution had made to address each Common Standard and program standard less than fully met. Evidence was presented for each of these standards and reviewed by the revisit team.

While most of the stipulations and standard findings focused specifically on documentation (such as assessments and rubrics), interviews were conducted with a variety of constituencies with the exception of graduates. In preparation for the visit, the revisit team determined that graduates would not be able to speak to recent changes in program requirements, curriculum, and fieldwork and therefore were not required for the revisit.

2015 Revisit Findings and Evidence

2014 Site Visit Decision	2015 Revisit Decision	Common Standards
Met with Concerns	Met	<p>Standard 3: Resources</p> <p><i>2014 Rationale: The IR, IR addendum and interviews with faculty and the chair indicate the department does not have sufficient budgetary resources to replace retired tenure track faculty, resulting in remaining faculty filling multiple roles, and increased hiring of part-time faculty.</i></p> <p><i>2015 Revisit Evidence:</i> Searches have been conducted to fill full time faculty positions in Single Subjects Science and in Multiple Subjects (up to 4 positions total). To date, offers have been made, but not yet accepted. The institution has provided resources needed to retain experienced adjunct faculty and lecturers during the search process. Some existing faculty roles have been restructured to enable faculty to focus more exclusively on instruction; additional restructuring is planned when FT faculty hiring is complete. Other actions include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institutional support for added flexibility in salary negotiations • Commitment of institutional administration to fund additional positions as new programs are approved and existing programs grow • Initiation of a strategic planning process for guiding College of Education development • Evaluation of fieldwork supervision procedures for all programs and adoption of changes to strengthen and improve candidate/Intern support during field experiences <p>Interviews with full-time, part-time, and adjunct faculty provided numerous examples of how leadership from the new Dean and Department Chair is promoting stronger collaboration across the unit as well as improvements in program operations. In addition, interviews with institutional leadership confirmed the university's commitment to providing resources to ensure the effective operation of the College and its programs.</p>
Met with Concerns	Met	<p>Standard 6: Advice and Assistance</p> <p><i>2014 Rationale: While most advising materials reviewed were consistent and accurate, various materials describing the coursework requirements for the Multiple and Single Subjects credential year-long residency program gave inconsistent information about what was</i></p>

		<p><i>required of candidates during the summer “prerequisite” phase. In addition, some Single Subject candidates reported receiving inconsistent information from advisors, both with regard to the summer prerequisites and other program requirements.</i></p> <p><i>2015 Revisit Evidence:</i> A review of revised program handbooks, advising sheets, and program materials on the College of Education web site indicated that all information on program requirements and course sequences is now consistent. Interviews with Multiple and Single Subjects candidates confirmed that all candidates had a clear understanding of program requirements and of the role that summer coursework plays in both programs and indicated that advising was consistent in both programs. In addition, the Dean and Department Chair described steps being taken to centralize and strengthen overall advising and support services for candidates in all programs.</p>
Not Met	Met	<p>Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence</p> <p><i>2014 Rationale: Assessment of candidate competencies in the Education Specialist credential program relies significantly on tasks completed during program coursework. Based on the documentation provided, and on interviews during the site visit, reviewers were unable to determine that candidate competency was assessed in all areas required by program standards.</i></p> <p><i>2015 Revisit Evidence:</i> A review of all Education Specialist credential program standards found less than fully met at the 2014 site visit has determined that all of those standards are now met. Since the site visit decision on this common standard was based solely on the findings for these program standards, Common Standard 9: Assessment of Candidate Competence is now determined to be met.</p>
Multiple Subjects		
Met with Concerns	Met	<p>Standard 2: Communication and Collaboration</p> <p><i>2014 Rationale: While sponsors of the preliminary teacher preparation program establish collaborative partnerships that contribute substantially to the quality and effectiveness of the implementation of candidate preparation, some candidates indicated that there may be inconsistent understanding of program expectations on the part of the cooperating teacher.</i></p> <p><i>2015 Revisit Evidence:</i> Substantial documentary and interview evidence was presented to support the standard finding. University</p>

		<p>supervisors provided a detailed description of</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Procedures for recruiting and selecting cooperating teachers • Initial orientation procedures and materials provided to prospective cooperating teachers • Procedures for documenting cooperating teacher roles/responsibilities • Pairs trainings with candidate/cooperating teachers held twice yearly • Interventions used when questions or concerns arose during co-teaching assignments <p>All procedures are clearly and consistently described in program documents, cooperating teacher agreements, and materials used in orientations and pairs trainings. Interviews with cooperating teachers confirmed all of the above procedures; and interviews with candidates provided further evidence that cooperating teachers have a clear understanding of program requirements of their roles/responsibilities as co-teachers.</p>
Met with Concerns	Met	<p>Standard 14: Learning to Teach through Supervised Fieldwork <i>2014 Rationale: Although the program includes a developmental sequence of carefully planned, substantive supervised field experiences, some candidates indicated that coursework scheduling had interfered with their participation in particular fieldwork experiences.</i></p> <p><i>2015 Revisit Evidence:</i> The Multiple and Single Subjects programs have responded to this concern by scheduling program coursework during fall and spring semesters to begin at 4:00 p.m. or later, and a review of class schedules confirmed this. Candidates unanimously indicated that this schedule enables them to participate fully in all field placement site activities. In addition, candidates provided examples of how program faculty made accommodations for one-time events such as Back-to-School Nights and Open Houses so candidates could participate in them regardless of when these were scheduled at a particular school.</p>
Met with Concerns	Met	<p>Standard 15: Qualifications of Individuals Who Provide School Site Support <i>2014 Rationale: While most candidates indicated that their cooperating teachers were well-informed about the performance expectations for the candidate's teaching and pertaining to his/her supervision of the candidate, some candidates reported uneven support by cooperating teachers and inconsistent access to teaching</i></p>

		<p><i>experiences that allowed them to practice and refine their instructional skills. Although these inconsistencies resulted in some differences among candidates' overall fieldwork experiences, there was no evidence to indicate that candidate preparation was negatively impacted.</i></p> <p><i>2015 Revisit Evidence:</i> Documentary evidence for this standard included all of the cooperating teacher information outlined in the narrative for Standard 2 above. In addition, interviews with candidates confirmed that cooperating teachers had a clear understanding of their responsibility to ensure that candidates had access to all teaching experiences necessary to develop and refine candidates' instructional skills. Numerous candidates stressed the flexibility that the co-teaching model provides for candidates to engage in "real teaching" as early in field placements as each candidate is ready and emphasized the depth of experience they gained by being fully immersed in teaching responsibilities for far longer than they would have been in a "two-week solo teaching" model.</p>
<p align="center">Single Subject</p>		
Met with Concerns	Met	<p>Standard 1: Program Design</p> <p><i>2014 Rationale: The Single Subject Credential Program describes a comprehensive assessment system but reviewers were unable to see evidence that all parts of the system are effectively implemented. Specifically, it was not possible to confirm that signature assignments were accurately measuring the required competencies.</i></p> <p><i>2015 Revisit evidence:</i> A review of three new signature assignments provided examples of tasks and rubrics that aligned directly with standards requirements. With regard to overall assessment, the program has also instituted a process for reviewing individual candidate progress relative to TPEs midway through the program for goal-setting purposes and prior to program exit for reviewing candidate progress relative to those goals.</p>
Met with Concerns	Met	<p>Standard 8B: Pedagogical Preparation for Subject-Specific Content Instruction</p> <p><i>2014 Rationale: Interviews with candidates indicated that although they felt adequately prepared to teach in their content area, different sections of the Curriculum & Instruction in the Secondary School</i></p>

		<p><i>Content Area course appeared to vary somewhat in scope and depth according to subject area.</i></p> <p><i>2015 Revisit Evidence:</i> Interviews with candidates indicated that they feel well prepared to teach in their content areas. Interviews with faculty who teach subject-specific pedagogy provided sufficient examples of course content and assignments across subject areas to confirm the depth and breadth of candidate preparation in each subject area.</p>
Met with Concerns	Met	<p>Standard 12: Preparation to Teach English Learners</p> <p><i>2014 Rationale: Unevenness of program implementation was found in the area of preparation to teach English learners. Some candidates and completers in interviews indicated they felt adequately prepared to provide instruction to English learners in their co-teaching or intern teaching classroom. Other candidates and completers indicated that they were not adequately prepared to effectively instruct English learners. Some comments were made that the English learner course was a crunch course and not well structured, that candidates were unaware of terminology important to English language instruction in California, or that candidates were not provided an opportunity to demonstrate or implement English language instruction in their co-teaching or intern teaching experience because they did not have English learners (or only had higher level/3 and above) in their classroom.</i></p> <p><i>2015 Revisit Evidence:</i> Documentary and interview evidence provided to support that this standard is now fully met included the following.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ED 628: Secondary Pedagogy Linguistic Diversity was extensively revised with new readings, assignments, and requirements to strengthen course content. This course, which is taught during summer session, requires that candidates complete fieldwork in schools with significant percentages of English Learners prior to student teaching, Intern assignments. • English Learner needs—and strategies for addressing them—are being infused throughout all program courses • All fieldwork placement sites for student teachers provide opportunities to work extensively with English Learners • Beginning in fall 2015, districts wishing to hire Interns from CSUMB programs must provide evidence that placement sites meet linguistic diversity criteria—or indicate the means by which they will ensure that Interns have opportunities to develop proficiency working with English Learners

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cooperating teachers confirmed that field placement sites provided consistent opportunities to develop skill in meeting the needs of English Learners, and to demonstrate competency in standards requirements Candidates confirmed that they were not only well-prepared to provide instruction to English Learners, but indicated that they often had more extensive knowledge and a greater repertoire of instructional strategies than experienced teachers at their field placement sites.
Met with Concerns	Met	<p>Standard 15: Qualifications of Individuals who Provide School Site Support</p> <p><i>2014 Rationale: Interviews with principals indicated that not all of those interviewed may be aware of the minimum state requirements for participating as a cooperating teacher. At the same time, there was no evidence to indicate that cooperating teachers are being assigned who do not meet these requirements.</i></p> <p><i>2015 Revisit Evidence: While no interviews were conducted with principals during the revisit, ample evidence was provided through documents and constituent interviews that procedures are being consistently followed to ensure that all individuals serving as cooperating teachers meet, or in most cases exceed minimum state requirements. This evidence is specifically described in the section on Standard 2 in the Multiple Subjects section above.</i></p>
Education Specialist		
Not Met	Met	<p>Program Standard 3: Educating Diverse Learners</p> <p><i>2014 Rationale: It is unclear from the program documentation and interviews how the program provides instruction in understanding and acceptance of differences in religion, gender identity/expression, and sexual orientation.</i></p> <p><i>2015 Revisit Evidence: A review of assignments and syllabi in SPED 568-Methodologies Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students confirmed that the program includes attention to understanding and acceptance of differences in religion, gender identity/expression and sexual orientation. Further confirmation came from candidates, faculty, and program coordinators. Candidates were able to provide evidence of demonstrating acceptance of differences in religion, gender identity/expression, and sexual orientation.</i></p>

Not Met	Met	<p>Program Standard 4: Effective Communication and Collaborative Partnerships</p> <p><i>2014 Rationale: It is unclear from the program documentation and interviews how the program provides the opportunity for candidates to demonstrate knowledge of building social networks for students with disabilities such as parents, primary caregivers, general education teachers, co-teachers, related services personnel, administrators and trans-disciplinary teams.</i></p> <p><i>2015 Revisit Evidence: SPED 585 (Transitions and Career Development) requires that candidates develop an Individualized Transition Plan in conjunction with parents, primary caregivers, and general education teachers. Interviews with candidates and supervisors corroborated the comprehensive nature of this assignment. In addition, the program provides the opportunity for the candidates to demonstrate knowledge of building social networks for students with disabilities, which was confirmed through interviews with candidates.</i></p>
Not Met	Met	<p>Program Standard 5: Assessment of Students</p> <p><i>2014 Rationale: It is unclear how the program provides opportunities for candidates to demonstrate knowledge of required statewide assessments and local, state, and federal accountability systems.</i></p> <p><i>2015 Revisit Evidence: Candidates, faculty and supervisors provided numerous examples of opportunities for candidates to acquire and demonstrate knowledge of required statewide assessments and local, state and federal accountability systems. A review of assessments in SPED 564 (Formal and Informal Assessment), 565 (Supervised Field Experience in General Education) and 568 (Methodologies for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students with Mild-Severe Special Needs) provided evidence that have opportunities to demonstrate competency in this standard requirement.</i></p>
Met w Concerns	Met	<p>Program Standard 7: Transition and Transitional Planning</p> <p><i>2014 Rationale: The program has an entire course addressing transition, SPED 585, Transition and Career Development for the Education Specialist. Interviews with faculty and review of course syllabi confirmed that assignments were in place, but the program did not clearly articulate how these assignments provide candidates with opportunities to demonstrate competency for this standard.</i></p> <p><i>2015 Revisit Evidence: Interviews with the Program Coordinator, the instructor for SPED 585, and candidates clearly demonstrated how</i></p>

		<p>three different assessments provide opportunities for candidates to demonstrate competency in this standard. Candidates are required to implement the Council for Exceptional Children's Life Center Education (LCE) curriculum as part of their classroom experience. The LCE emphasizes teaching students with disabilities both self-advocacy and self-determination skills in addition to a comprehensive list of life skills. Candidates are assessed on these skills and reflect on what they would need to include to create effective self-determination and self-advocacy lessons.</p>
Not Met	Met	<p>Program Standard 8: Participating in ISFP/IEP and Post-Secondary Transition Planning</p> <p><i>2014 Rationale: It is unclear how candidates demonstrate the ability to participate effectively as a team member and/or case manager for the IFSP/IEP/transition planning process, from pre-referral interventions, assessment, and implementation of instruction.</i></p> <p><i>2015 Revisit Evidence:</i> The program has made significant improvements to coursework and practicum requirements over the past year with respect to providing candidates with the opportunity to learn the components of an ISFP/IEP and transition planning. The program adopted an extensive IEP rubric that will be implemented beginning Fall, 2015 to review IEPs for their content and clarity.</p> <p>In the Fall practicum candidates will be required to review an IEP using the new IEP rubric and write a reflection on how the IEP has exceeded or did not meet the criteria outlined in the rubric. In the Curriculum Development course, candidates will be required to write an IEP which will be evaluated against the new rubric. Finally, in their final semester practicum, candidates will submit a completed IEP which will be evaluated by the University Supervisor against the new rubric. This aspect of the program is being implemented for the first time in the current semester.</p> <p>In addition, the program has piloted and has grant funding to explore further the use of mock IEPs to assist candidates in practicing various scenarios they may encounter in participating in IEPs. The institution has partnered with Cal Poly SLO on this pilot effort. Candidates who have participated in the mock IEP reported that they found this activity extremely valuable to their understanding of the various challenges with managing an IEP meeting.</p> <p>The program has also adopted a new textbook to assist the candidates in the writing of IEPs.</p>

Met with Concerns	Met	<p>Program Standard 9: Preparation to Teach Reading/Language Arts <i>2014 Rationale: It is unclear how the listening and speaking portion of the standard is addressed in the program.</i></p> <p><i>2015 Revisit Evidence:</i> Review of the syllabus from ED 616 (Language and Literacy Development Across the Curriculum I) indicates candidates have several assignments on vocabulary development such as developing three language arts lessons involving phonemic awareness, phonics/spelling, fluency, and vocabulary development. These lessons must include listening, speaking, reading and writing strategies. A review of the syllabus for SPED 568 (Methodologies for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Learners in Special Education) confirmed that the course includes units based on evaluation of language competence and instructional planning and modifications to increase effectiveness of learning which include listening and speaking.</p>
Not Met	Met	<p>Program Standard 10: Preparation to Teach English Language Learners <i>2014 Rationale: Through interviews with faculty and review of course syllabi, assignments were in place, but the program did not clearly articulate how these assignments provide candidates with opportunities to demonstrate competency for all aspects of this standard.</i></p> <p><i>2015 Revisit Evidence:</i> Since the 2014 site visit, the program has made significant improvements in strengthening the focus on the preparation to teach English Language Learners. Interviews with the Program Coordinator detailed how all syllabi were reviewed and additional readings and assignments in the area of ELL were added. The Dean played an important role in this effort and provided a number of suggested readings for inclusion in the coursework. In addition, the program adopted the EdTPA for use in candidate assessment. The EdTPA includes demonstration of direct teaching with English Learners.</p> <p>All candidates interviewed at the revisit confirmed they had opportunities to work with English Learners. Program leadership, faculty, and university supervisors confirmed that the school sites in which candidates are placed are carefully chosen to ensure a diverse setting in which candidates have opportunities to work with English Learners. Currently, all Interns are in schools with significant numbers of English Learners. Program leaders discussed ways in which the program will ensure that all future Interns work only in</p>

		settings that have English Learners or ensure that districts hiring Interns provide alternative means for Interns to develop proficiency in working with English Learners.
Met with Concern	Met	<p>Program Standard 13: Curriculum and Instruction of Students with Disabilities</p> <p><i>2014 Rationale: It is not clear how candidates demonstrate competency for collaboration or co-teaching.</i></p> <p><i>2015 Revisit Evidence:</i> The program curriculum covers co-teaching in SPED 560 (Inclusionary Practices) where candidates are required to identify appropriate and inappropriate examples of effective consultation and collaboration in Case Studies. In addition, during their two Practicum courses candidates are observed by their University Supervisors who use the Candidate Evaluation Tool as a means for assessing candidates' co-teaching and collaborative practices.</p>
Not Met	Met	<p>Program Standard 14: Creating Healthy Learning Environments</p> <p><i>2014 Rationale: It is unclear how candidates demonstrate competency in the areas of diverse family structures, community cultures, and child rearing practices in order to develop respectful and productive relationships with families and communities. It is unclear how candidates demonstrate competency in understanding and utilizing universal precautions designed to protect the health and safety of the candidates themselves such as demonstrating safe lifting and positioning practices of students with motor impairments and demonstrating an ability to use and instruct other personnel in the appropriate use, maintenance, and care of rehabilitative and medically necessary equipment such as wheelchairs, walkers, orthotics, prosthetics, etc. It is unclear how candidates demonstrate competency in working collaboratively with other professionals to ensure healthy learning environments.</i></p> <p><i>(Note: the 2014 Rationale was focused on Program Planning Prompts question rather than on the standard itself. Evidence gathering and review at the revisit was refocused on the actual language of the standard regarding "universal precautions designed to protect the health and safety of the candidates themselves.")</i></p> <p><i>2015 Revisit Evidence:</i> A review of syllabi and assignments in ED 550 (Health Education), SPED 571 (Teaching and Assessing Students with Autism, SPED 568 (Methods for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Students with Mild-Severe Special Needs) confirms that all the</p>

		<p>requirements of the standard are addressed, including those regarding universal precautions.</p> <p>Interviews with candidates, faculty, cooperating teachers and university supervisors documented that the candidates demonstrated competency in diverse family structures, universal precautions, and working collaboratively with others through assignments, assessments, and observations by clinical supervisors.</p>
Mild/Moderate Disabilities		
Not Met	Met	<p>M/M Standard 2: Assessment and Evaluation of Students with Mild/Moderate Disabilities</p> <p><i>2014 Rationale: It is unclear how candidates demonstrate competency for assessing communication, career, and community life skill needs of students and monitor students' progress. It is unclear how the candidates demonstrate competency for students participating in state-mandated accountability measures.</i></p> <p><i>2015 Revisit Evidence:</i> Interviews with the Program Coordinators, faculty for SPED 585 (Transition and Career Development for the Education Specialist) and candidates clearly demonstrated how a variety of assessments, such as the Individualized Transition Plan Assignment and Life Center Education Lesson Assignment and Assessment, provide opportunities for candidates to exhibit competency of this standard.</p> <p>Candidates, faculty and supervisors provided numerous examples of opportunities for candidates to demonstrate knowledge of required statewide assessments and local, state and federal accountability systems. Evidence provided by assessments in three different courses also provided evidence of the candidate's proficiency.</p>
Met with Concerns	Met	<p>M/M Standard 3: Planning and Implementing Mild/Moderate Curriculum and Instruction</p> <p><i>2014 Rationale: It is unclear how candidates demonstrate their ability to use a variety of grouping structures in the program coursework other than fieldwork. There is no indication of this in the SPED 568 syllabus as indicated on the resubmission.</i></p> <p><i>(Note: the 2014 Rationale was focused on Program Planning Prompts question rather than on the standard itself. Evidence gathering and review at the revisit was refocused on the actual language of the standard regarding use of "evidence-based instructional strategies . . .</i></p>

		<p><i>across an array of environments and activities.”)</i></p> <p><i>2015 Revisit Evidence:</i> A review of syllabi and assignments in coursework such as <i>SPED 571 Teaching and Assessing Students with ASD</i> confirm that candidates are required to select and implement an Evidence Based Practice with a student as part of their Curriculum Development/Adaptation Project. Additional syllabi and rubrics have recently been updated to clearly indicate the focus, use and assessment of candidate competency with Evidence Based Practices. Candidates also have discussions about why some of widely-used current practices are not considered “Evidence-Based Practices” and why those may not be as effective as evidence-based practices.</p> <p>Interviews with candidates, faculty and clinical supervisors confirmed that program courses have clearly-articulated requirements that candidates must meet in order to demonstrate competency, and that candidates are assessed on their use of Evidence-Based Practices.</p>
Not Met	Met	<p>M/M Standard 6: Case Management</p> <p><i>2014 Rationale: It is unclear how candidates demonstrate their understanding of case management practices and strategies for students with mild/moderate disabilities and for those referred for special education services—such as the ability to provide consultation, resource information, and materials regarding individuals with exceptional needs to their parents and to staff members; monitoring of pupil progress on a regular basis; participation in the review and revision of IEP’s as appropriate; and referral of pupils who do not demonstrate appropriate progress to the IEP team.</i></p> <p><i>2015 Revisit Evidence:</i> As indicated in the narrative for Program Standard 8 above, the program has adopted an IEP rubric for candidates to use in reviewing IEPs for content and clarity. Candidates must also write an IEP to be evaluated by the IEP rubric. Each candidate’s university supervisor must also evaluate one of the candidate’s completed IEPs using the IEP rubric. Evidence was provided in interviews with candidates, faculty and university supervisors that the assignments in SPED 561 (Reading Diagnosis and Preferred Practices for Students with Learning Challenges) enable candidates to demonstrate understanding of case management practices. Candidates confirmed in interviews that they felt prepared for their roles as case managers.</p>

Moderate/Severe Disabilities		
Not Met	Met	<p>M/S Standard 5: Movement, Mobility, Sensory and Specialized Health Care</p> <p><i>2014 Rationale: It is unclear how one set of “end of module responses” can address all of competencies required in this standard, including skills to facilitate individual student initiation of and generalized use of mobility and other functional motor movements to promote maximum participation and involvement in activities; an understanding of the impact of sensory impairment on movement and motor development and the corresponding ability to effectively facilitate both motor and sensory functioning; current assistive and adaptive devices as well as knowledge of and a facility with the state adopted modifications and accommodations; the ability to share information regarding sensory, movement, mobility, and specialized health care needs and procedures with general educators, students, parents and others to increase the level of understanding and sensitivity; the ability to arrange classroom environments to accommodate sensory movement, mobility, specialized health care needs, while promoting positive, proactive and respectful behaviors, students’ independence, and the dignity of students with disabilities.</i></p> <p><i>(Note: the 2014 Rationale was focused on Program Planning Prompts question rather than on the standard itself. Evidence gathering and review at the revisit was refocused on how the program addresses standards requirements with regard to students across the entire range of M/S disabilities (not just autism) and the procedures required for procuring services to meet M/S student needs.)</i></p> <p><i>2015 Revisit Evidence:</i> A review of syllabi and assignments for SPED 571 (Teaching and Assessing Students with ASD) indicated that the various requirements of this standard are clearly addressed in coursework. Although this course title indicates a focus on ASD, it maintains a strong emphasis on addressing many of the needs of students across the entire range of moderate to severe disabilities.</p> <p>Interviews with the Program Coordinator and faculty revealed that a total of six modules in the SPED 571 class address the specialized needs of Moderate/Severe students, and that all of the modules have extensive questions regarding the required readings. Reviewers confirmed that the six- module course contains a focus on mobility, movement, sensory and specialized healthcare across the moderate to severe spectrum. Additionally reviewers</p>

		<p>confirmed that candidate competencies in movement, mobility sensory and specialized health care needs are assessed in the final semester of Practicum.</p> <p>In addition, reviewers confirmed that the assistive technology class (ED 538 B) and the health education class (ED 550) also address the competencies required by this standard.</p>
Autism Spectrum Disorders Added Authorization		
Not Met	Met	<p>ASDAA Standard 1: Characteristics of ASD</p> <p><i>2014 Rationale: It is unclear how candidates demonstrate their unique knowledge of cognition and neurology and the core challenges associated with language and communication, social skills, behavior, and processing and their implications for program planning and service delivery. It is unclear how candidates demonstrate that they can identify the unique characteristics of students with ASD. Through review of course syllabi, assignments were in place, but the program did not clearly articulate how these assignments provide candidates with opportunities to demonstrate competency for this standard.</i></p> <p><i>2015 Revisit Evidence:</i> After interviews with candidates, supervisors, and faculty it was confirmed that several modules in SPED 571 Teaching and Assessing Students with Autism Spectrum Disorders deal specifically with the challenges of language, social skills, behavior and processing for students with autism, and how to identify these characteristics in students. Reviewers confirmed through a review of syllabi and assignments that candidate's competencies are assessed at the end of every module through a variety of means.</p>